

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 649

EC 160 806

TITLE Chronicle of Academic and Artistic Precocity, Vol. 1, No. 3, May/June 1982.

INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe, Dept. of Special Education.

PUB DATE 82

NOTE 8p.

AVAILABLE FROM Chronicle of Academic and Artistic Precocity, c/o PSAP, Department of Special Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287 (\$7.50 per year).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)

JOURNAL CIT Chronicle of Academic and Artistic Precocity; vl n3 May-Jun 1982

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Program Descriptions; *State Legislation; State Surveys; Statistical Data; *Summer Programs; Talent

IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; *Project for Study of Academic Precocity

ABSTRACT

The Chronicle contains two major articles and several smaller articles concerned with education of the gifted. "Special Educational Services for Gifted Students in Arizona: Description of Programs and Analysis of the Short-Term Impact of the State's Legislative Mandate," by S. Cohn and V. Riccardo, reports on a survey of all Arizona school districts concerning their services for the gifted. Statistics are reported concerning: compliance with the mandate, program longevity, ages of students served, percentage of schools within the district with special programs, program funding, types of programs, enrichment options, identification procedures, and program evaluation. Noted is a doubling in the number of districts reporting having special programs for gifted students. The second article, "PSAP's Summer Residential Program" by Craig Burton, describes the summer program of the Project for the Study of Academic Precocity, which is serving gifted and talented 7th and 8th graders at Arizona State University. Brief articles examine the International Baccalaureate program, a new Arizona law requiring separate mathematical and verbal reasoning scores for identifying gifted students, the role of the community in public education, the Junior Great Book Series, and suggested directories of resources for the gifted and talented. (CL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

CHRONICLE

OF ACADEMIC AND ARTISTIC PRECOCITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Published by the
Project for the Study of Academic Precocity
Department of Special Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287
(602) 965-4757

Vol. 1 No. 3

May/June 1982
"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. J. Cohn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR GIFTED STUDENTS IN ARIZONA: DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS AND ANALYSIS OF THE SHORT-TERM IMPACT OF THE STATE'S LEGISLATIVE MANDATE

Sanford J. Cohn, Ph.D. and Vicki A. Riccardo¹

In the spring of 1980, the Arizona State Legislature passed into law a mandate for special educational services to be delivered to gifted students. The specific language of that law (ARS 15-1015 F) follows:

The governing board of each district shall provide special academic assistance to students in the district whose test results are two standard deviations above the norm on an approved test. The State Board of Education shall adopt a list of approved tests for this purpose. Assistance to gifted students shall only include expanding academic curriculum offerings as may be required to provide an educational program which is appropriate to the needs of the gifted student.*

Funding for education of gifted students is included in the basic block grant (Arizona Group A programs) as detailed in ARS 15-1202.02 B.7. The Group A weight was increased by .005 to provide state support for education of gifted students. Using the total student count for the state of 491,149,541, this weight increased the established state support level by \$3,526,306 for the 1980-81 school year. This was equal to \$7.18 for each student in the state; or, based upon 3% of the school population, this would equate to \$239 (\$3,526,306 divided by 14,734 students) per gifted student (Brunstein, 1980).

Immediately prior to the passage of ARS 15-1015 F (i.e., during the 1979-80 school year), the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) officially recognized 90 school districts (43%) out of the state's 209 districts as having "Approved Gifted Programs" (ADE, 1979). No guidelines as to how "approval" was granted are available.

At the start of the 1980-81 academic year, the investigators began a policy analysis of the short-term effects that the legislative mandate had (or did not have) upon the types and characteristics of special educational services delivered to gifted youths in Arizona.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A 22-item questionnaire and cover letter was sent to the superintendent of each of the 209 school districts in Arizona. The questionnaire was designed to determine whether or not special educational services for gifted students were being provided by the schools in the districts, and, if so, to seek some description about the nature of the services delivered to those students. A copy of the questionnaire is available upon request.

RESPONSE

All 209 school districts were contacted ultimately, so that there was a 100% response to the survey. Forty-six percent (96) responded to the initial query. An additional 7% (15) responded to the reminder prompt (a postcard sent only to those who hadn't responded to the first appeal). The remaining 47% (98) were contacted directly by telephone, and the questionnaires were completed by telephone interview.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

One hundred twenty-eight districts (61%) reported that they had a program to serve gifted or highly able children at the time of the survey. 80 (38.5%) reported that they had no such special programs, and 1 (0.5%) district categorically refused to answer any of the questions.

(Continued on Page 2)

PSAP'S SUMMER RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM

Craig Blurton*

Last summer, for the first time, the Project for the Study of Academic Precocity (PSAP) offered a residential component as part of its summer academic program. This article describes the program as it existed last summer, evaluates it subjectively, and discusses implications for this summer's residential component.

The residency program is available to students enrolled in PSAP's Summer Classes for Talent Search participants (mainly seventh and eighth graders) who wish to live on campus while attending the classes in order to benefit from interacting with other able students over common interests in a supervised situation.

During the summer of 1981, 47 students from 10 states lived on campus, two to a room, for six weeks while attending classes. They were housed in Best Hall, an attractive dormitory used during the academic year as a residential hall for undergraduate students. Best Hall consists of three separate but adjacent buildings. Our students occupied one wing but had access to the central wing facilities. They ate their meals, included in the residential fee, at Palo Verde East, another dormitory located across campus.

Male students lived on part of the first floor and the entire second floor of Best Hall's "C" wing, while female students occupied most of the third floor. Although space was shared with another group of students for a few weeks, for all intents and purposes, the entire wing was used by PSAP.

The residential staff included two full-time live-in female counselors, three day counselors, a family counselor and social worker with extensive experience in counseling gifted and talented students and their families, and the author. The two female live-in counselors roomed with the girls on the third floor and the author lived with the boys.

In addition to the wing in which we resided, the students had access to the central wing's facilities which included a game room, a large study room, pay telephones, and snack vending machines. Our wing was equipped with a laundry room and a combination television and study room. The students also had access to other campus facilities including the library, music practice rooms, Grady Gammage Auditorium, various campus museums, the Aquatics Center, tennis courts, athletic fields, and the Memorial Union (which houses a bowling alley, electronics game center, snack bars, movie theater, and barbershop).

Some of the activities available on campus to the students (e.g., the movie theater, snack bars, etc.) were not included in the price of the residency program. In order to facilitate the use of those activities, students were allowed to establish "mini-accounts" at the University Cashier's Office to draw upon for funds, subject to limitations established by their parents. Money could be withdrawn at the end of each week for the following week's activities.

PSAP classes were held in various campus buildings within easy walking distance of the dormitory. Tutoring sessions were offered nightly in the dormitory's study rooms by members of the residential and academic staffs for those students who wished to participate.

Recreational activities were an important part of the residential experience and were offered throughout the six weeks. These activities were developed by the staff after surveying student interests with a questionnaire. PSAP staff members felt it was necessary to offer outlets for youthful energy without overemphasizing these activities to the detriment of the program's academic goals. A wide variety of activities were offered so that students would have a selection to choose

(Continued on Page 4)

COMPLIANCE WITH THE MANDATE

Of the 80 districts that reported no special services for the gifted:

- (a) 30% (24) reported that they are comprised of small schools and that they comply with the mandate by individualizing the curriculum for each student;
- (b) 23% (18) indicated that they were studying the problem;
- (c) 15% (12) reported to be starting programs during the 1980-81 school year;
- (d) 14% (11) reported to be starting programs during the 1981-82 school year;
- (e) 11% (9) reported that they send their gifted students to programs in other districts;
- (f) 4% (3) did not respond to the question of how they plan to comply with the mandate;
- (g) 1% (1) reported that they will update their existing program;
- (h) 1% (1) reported that they are already in compliance with the mandate; and,
- (i) 1% (1) reported that they do not plan to comply with the mandate at all.

Of the 128 districts that indicated having special programs for gifted students:

- (a) 40% (52) reported that they were in compliance with the mandate;
- (b) 19% (24) reported to be in compliance but in reality were not, because they did not have a program that encompassed all grades and all ages [relative to their district's range];
- (c) 15% (20) reported that they will update their existing program;
- (d) 9% (11) reported to be starting programs during the 1980-81 school year;
- (e) 5% (6) reported to be starting programs during the 1981-82 school year;
- (f) 5% (6) reported that they were studying the problem;
- (g) 4% (5) refused to answer the question of how they plan to comply with the mandate;
- (h) 1% (2) reported that they are comprised of small schools and that they comply by individualizing the curriculum for each student;
- (i) 0.5% (1) reported that they did not know about the mandate; and,
- (j) 0.5% (1) claimed to comply with the mandate but in reality are not in compliance because they do not have a program for students in all of the schools in their district.

PROGRAM LONGEVITY

Of the 128 districts that reported having special programs in place to meet the educational needs of gifted or highly able students:

- (a) 16% (21) reported beginning their programs during the 1980-81 school year [by the time they responded to the survey];
- (b) 37% (47) reported that they had been in existence from one to three years [with 32% (40) reporting to have started during the 1979-80 academic year];
- (c) 40% (51) reported to have been in existence from four to six years; and,
- (d) 7% (9) reported to have been in existence from seven to 12 years.

In all, then, 98 districts reported to have had programs in place during the 1979-80 school year. This figure is eight above the 90 "Approved Gifted Programs" documented by the Arizona Department of Education for the 1979-80 school year. (Perhaps, this 9% "inflation" figure should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of this self-report survey.)

If one recognizes that, while ARS 15-1015 F was passed in the spring of 1980, public discussion and committee hearings about the pending bill (H.B. 2013) were conducted throughout 1979 as well, one can conclude that the overall effect of the mandate in stimulating programs was an increase of 61 districts reporting them (from 1979-80 onward) over the 67 programs in place prior to that time. This is a 191% increase. That is, the mandate and its precedent discussion and publicity nearly doubled the number of districts with special programs in the state.³

AGES OF STUDENTS SERVED

The age range of students served in the 128 districts reporting special programs varied a great deal for a variety of reasons. Some of the districts were elementary districts, others were high school districts, and still others were unified school districts. Some districts, however, limited special services to students in only certain grades.

Gifted students in fifth through eighth grades were most frequently reported as being served, as depicted in Table 1, which indicates the percentages of districts reporting to serve gifted students in the specified age ranges.

TABLE 1
Districts reporting to provide special educational services for gifted youths at various grade levels

Grade Level Ranges	Percentage of Districts Delivering Special Services
Fifth through eighth	86% (110)
Fourth through eighth	82% (105)
Third through eighth	79% (101)
Second through eighth	72% (92)
First through eighth	64% (82)
Kindergarten through eighth	37% (47)
Ninth through twelfth	34% (44)*

*Considering only those districts that serve high school students (105), this percentage is slightly higher, 42%.

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS WITHIN THE DISTRICT WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Eighty-four percent (108) of the 128 districts with programs reported that all of the schools in the district had special services for gifted students. Seven percent (9) reported that 76-99% of the schools in the district had special programs; 2% (2) reported 51-75% of the schools in the district; 5% (6) reported 26-50% of the schools in the district; and 2% (3) reported 0-25% of the schools in the district.

PROGRAM FUNDING

Responses about funding from the 128 districts that reported having special programs ranged from "umbrella funding", "very little" and \$7.00 per student (using the whole student body as reference) to \$250,000 per year from outside agencies in the form of grants. This item was answered so inconsistently that meaningful analysis is impossible at this time.

Eighty-one percent (103) of the 128 districts with programs did report, however, that money allocated for the gifted was spent as budgeted. One percent (1) of the districts each indicated that funds were spent elsewhere all of the time, most of the time, and/or some of the time. Five percent (7) indicated that funds were shuttled rarely. And 12% (15) refused to answer this item.

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Data describing program types are presented in Table 2. Percentages were calculated using the 128 districts that reported having programs as the base figure.

TABLE 2
Districts reporting various program types

Program Type	Districts Reporting Program Type
Resource room at each school	34% (44)
Specific subject-matter classes at each school	23% (30)
Resource room serving several schools	22% (28)
Specific subject-matter classes drawing from entire district	10% (13)
Individualized curriculum	5% (8)
Regional resource center	3% (2)
Resource room in elementary schools, subject-matter classes in junior high	1% (1)
Other	2% (2)

Clearly, the resource room was the predominant program type in place during the 1980-81 school year. This was most likely for elementary school districts (or elementary grades of unified school districts). High school districts were more likely to have specific subject-matter classes.

POLICY REGARDING SKIPPING GRADES

Fifty-five percent (71) of the 128 districts with special programs reported that they simply do not allow youngsters to move outside of the age-grade lockstep by skipping grades. Twenty-two percent (28) reported that they allow grade skipping, and an additional 2% (3) noted that they allow it occasionally. Twenty-one percent (26) of the districts with programs refused to answer this item.

ENRICHMENT OPTIONS

Ninety-two percent (118) of the districts with programs reported that they allow for enrichment of the typical curriculum. Of that group, 86% (101) indicated that the enrichment involved exposing children to subject-matter they would meet at more advanced grade levels. Only 39% (46) of that group, however, reported that completion of advanced subject-matter by the student was certified, so that boredom at a later (perhaps more crucial) point in the child's development is avoided.

POLICY REGARDING SUBJECT-MATTER ACCELERATION

Of the 128 districts claiming special programs, 54% (70) reported that they allow students to move more quickly than typical through a particular subject-matter curriculum; 44% (56) said that they do not; and 2% (2) refused to answer the item. Of the 70 districts that allow quick passage, 79% (55) reported that they certify the students' accomplishments to avoid the possibility of their having to repeat subject-matter at a later date (e.g., in the event of moving to another district or state), twenty percent (14) of those 70 districts reported that they do not certify a youth's accomplishment of advanced level subject-matter, and 1% (1) refused to answer the question regarding certification.

IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

Types of Giftedness Sought

Data describing district identification programs in several talent areas are presented in Table 3. About ¼ of the districts with programs reported that they identify, specifically, verbally and/or mathematically talented children. Nearly ¼ of the districts with programs noted, however, that they use the global intelligence test (IQ) to identify a gifted child.

TABLE 3
Districts seeking youths talented in various areas

Talent Area	Percentage of Districts Seeking Talented Youths in that Area
Global Intelligence (using IQ)	74% (95)
Verbal Talent	67% (86)
Mathematical Talent	66% (84)
Artistic Talent	26% (33)
Musical Talent	23% (29)
Athletic Talent	9% (12)

Approximately ¼ of the districts with programs reported identifying artistically and musically talented youngsters. And less than 1/10 of the districts reported seeking athletically talented youths (as part of their special services for gifted children). Of course, special services for artistically talented children and athletically talented children were not legislatively mandated.

Types of Tests Used

Data relevant to the tests used to identify gifted children are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Types of tests used to identify gifted youths

Type of Test	Percentage of Districts Reporting Using the Test
Individually administered intelligence test	72% (92)
Subscores from an achievement test battery	64% (82)
Group administered intelligence test	37% (47)
Total test battery score	15% (19)
Subscores from an aptitude test battery	5% (7)
Torrance Tests of Creativity	5% (6)
Structure of Intellect/Learning Abilities Test	2% (2)

The use of the global intelligence tests dominates the list with the individually administered test most often used. While individual administration does allow one-to-one interaction, and hence is perceived as more personal, it is the most susceptible to deviations from the test's standardization procedures, the least efficient, and the most expensive alternative.

Subscores from an achievement test are preferable to total test battery scores because the former yield information about a youngster's profile of developed skills in subject-matter content and are therefore meaningful for educational planning. It is good to see that the subscores are used more frequently than the total test battery scores for identifying gifted students (64% and 15%, respectively).

Perhaps the best measures of specific abilities (in contrast to developed skills) are the subscores from an aptitude test battery. At present these scores, which have been shown to cut across socioeconomic and ethnic boundaries quite effectively (Fox, 1981), and to locate youngsters who reason extremely well mathematically and/or verbally, are reported as relatively underutilized (5%). (In the authors' experience the use of this type of identification instrument is on the rise.)

Other Identification Procedures

In the attempt to move away from test scores as the sole means of finding gifted children, many programs have turned toward nominations (or referrals) from parents, teachers, and students. While such procedures may be appropriate for referral to school counselors for further assessment of the child's abilities, they are much too vulnerable to the whims of the person nominating (or refusing to) be effective as identifiers of gifted children if used alone. Of the 128 districts with special programs, the percentage that reported using several different types of nominations as part or all of their identification process are indicated in Table 5.

TABLE 5
Districts using nomination procedures
to identify gifted students

Type of Nomination	Percentage of Districts Indicating Use
Teacher nominations	93% (119)
Parent nominations	73% (94)
Student nominations	41% (52)

In the arts areas, the use of auditions for musically talented youths and evaluations of student products (portfolios) represent feasible, meaningful, and practical identification procedures. While 23% of the 128 districts with special programs claimed to seek musically talented students, only 6% (8) of the districts reported using auditions. Thirty percent (39) of the districts reported using evaluations of student products as an identification procedure (although not specifically for artistically talented youths, obviously, since only 26% [33] districts reported serving such youngsters).

Student interviews were reported as an identification procedure by 17% (22) of the districts with programs, and other (not specified) procedures were reported by 3% (4) of the districts with programs.

Special Identification Procedures for Finding Gifted Minority and Handicapped Students

Sixteen percent (21) of the 128 districts with programs for gifted students reported using special identification procedures (of any kind) to find gifted minority youngsters. Three percent (4) reported using special procedures to find gifted handicapped students, while 8% (10) reported using special procedures to identify both. Seventy-three percent (93) of the districts with programs reported using no special procedures for these subpopulations.

GROUPING OF STUDENTS IN SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Forty-five percent (58) of the 128 districts with special programs reported that they grouped students by chronological age, while 32% (41) reported using ability measures to group students. Twenty-three percent (29) of the districts with programs refused to answer this item.

Chronological age grouping results in extremely heterogeneous class composition, a difficult circumstance unless instruction is totally individualized. Ability grouping using global intelligence tests is not as effective (because of the heterogeneous grouping with regard to specific abilities that results) as using specific ability measures (e.g., of mathematical reasoning and verbal reasoning) (Stanley, 1977, pp. 75-112).

SPECIAL PROGRAM STAFF

Teachers in special programs for the gifted in the 128 districts reporting them were selected by means of a wide variety of methods. Nearly all were appointed, some on the basis of "the standard interview process," some because of subject-matter expertise, some because of seniority, and so forth. Special training of teachers and/or staff members who work in programs for the gifted was required by only 36% (46) of the districts with programs.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Sixty-six percent (85) of the 128 districts with special programs reported that they conduct evaluations to assess program effectiveness (although actual procedures usually involved observation and discussion, so the quality of these evaluations is indeterminate from this survey). Of those 85 districts that conduct evaluations of their programs, 65% (55) reported performing them once a year, 18% (15) twice a year, and 12% (10) more than twice a year. Thirty-one percent (40) of the 128 districts with programs did comment about outstanding achievements, such as success with undermotivated students, sending students to university-based programs, being named a model program by the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC), and success of students in college.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The number of districts who reported having special programs for gifted youngsters nearly doubled (67 to 128) from the 1979-80 to 1980-81 academic year. Among the set of possible factors relevant to this

phenomenon, two stand out. The first of these centers upon the role of the federally funded (1979-80 only) state coordinator for the gifted and talented, who traveled extensively and stimulated much interest in programs for the gifted during her term of office. And the second factor most likely involves the legislative mandate. Many other districts did indicate that they would start programs within a year or two (of the survey). District personnel did complain, however, about the nature of funding for the delivery of special assistance to academically gifted students (i.e., block grants).

In those districts with programs (61%), fifth through eighth graders were most often served as were elementary school children in general, with the exception of kindergartners and first graders. Gifted high school students were rarely served. Typically, elementary school programs involved resource centers and high school programs involved specific subject-matter classes.

More than half (55%) of the districts with special programs for the gifted reported that they did not allow a student to bypass the educational age-grade lockstep by skipping grades. Only 22% (28) reported that they did allow acceleration by grade skipping.

Regardless of whether the program was considered enrichment or accelerative, district personnel recognized that advanced subject-matter was being taught, while only a relatively small percentage of districts with programs certified students' accomplishments to avoid postponement of boredom by repeating material already covered at a later time.

Most programs reported seeking children who score high on global intelligence tests (both individually and group administered). Two-thirds of the districts with programs reported seeking mathematically and/or verbally talented youths. And about ¼ of the districts with programs included seeking children talented in fine arts and music. While "creativity" has been much discussed, very few districts (5%) reported using an acknowledged instrument (albeit a very weak one) to identify "creatively gifted" children. Very few districts with programs reported using the valuable specific ability test batteries (5%) to identify academically talented youngsters, although the authors indicate an increase in their use. Teacher nominations were reported by nearly all (93%) of the districts with special programs, in spite of the notorious fallibility teachers have demonstrated in identifying highly able youngsters (Pegnato & Birch, 1959).

Students in programs were rarely grouped according to their specific abilities, and most districts reported no special attempts to identify gifted minority or handicapped students.

Specific training for teachers of the gifted was reported to be required by only 36% of the districts with programs. About two-thirds of the districts with programs reported having evaluation procedures of any kind (most of them with an extremely weak evaluation design).

While the positive effects of the federally funded state coordinator and the legislative mandate are very satisfying, there is still much room for growth (in numbers and quality), if our public schools are to meet the educational needs of academically gifted students in addition to those of average or below average students.

*Editor's note: Since this article was written, a new Arizona Law, SB 1140, has been adopted which requires the use of separate mathematical and verbal reasoning scores obtained in an out-of-level testing paradigm. For more details about the law see the article "New Arizona Law" on page 6 in this issue.

FOOTNOTES

¹Dr. Sanford J. Cohn is Assistant Professor in the Department of Special Education at Arizona State University, where he also directs the Project for the Study of Academic Precocity (PSAP). Vicki A. Riccardo was a senior undergraduate Honors College student who coordinated this survey and developed an honors senior thesis from the data collected. The authors wish to express gratitude to Catherine M. G. Cohn for her assistance with data collection and analysis, as well as Reyad Essa.

²While this figure, 209 school districts in Arizona, may not be the officially recognized number, it was arrived at in the following manner. Survey questionnaires were sent to every school district listed in the Directory of Arizona Public Schools published by the Arizona Department of Education. A few letters were returned because of incorrect addresses (typographical errors were not made in transcribing addresses from the book to address labels). Several other districts reported that while they had trailers and some supplies, they contained no students at that time (these were transitional school districts).

³During the 1979-80 school year Eleanor TeSelle served as the federally funded state coordinator of programs for the gifted. Mrs. TeSelle traveled to all parts of the state during her one year posi-

tion, discussing programs and the pending mandate with school personnel and parent groups. This activity certainly enhanced the development of new district programs in addition to the mandate and its precedent publicity.

Also worthy of note is the fact that Arizona's first full time university level position in education of the gifted was filled at the start of the 1979-80 academic year. Dr. Sanford J. Cohn was appointed to that position and traveled extensively throughout the state talking with school district personnel and parent groups.

REFERENCES

- Arizona Department of Education (ADE). List of approved gifted programs for the 1979-80 school year. Unpublished bulletin. Phoenix: Arizona Department of Education, 1979.
- Brunstein, J. J. Personal communication to Arizona State Senator Robert Usane from James J. Brunstein, Associate Superintendent, Arizona Department of Education, October 1, 1980.
- Fox, L. H. Identification of the academically gifted. *American Psychologist*, 1981, 36, 1103-1111.
- Pegnato, C. W., & Birch, J. W. Locating gifted children in junior high schools - a comparison of methods. *Exceptional Children*, 1959, 25, 300-304.
- Stanley, J. C. Rationale of the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth (SMPY) during its first five years of promoting educational acceleration. In J. C. Stanley, W. C. George, & C. H. Solano (Eds.), *The Gifted and the Creative: a Fifty Year Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

SUMMER PROGRAM Continued from Page 1

from which would fit their interests. All participation in recreational activities was voluntary.

Each week, a scheduling meeting was held during which the students were informed of the following week's activities and were given an opportunity to sign up for them. Sign-up sheets and regular communication with the academic staff maintained control over participation in these recreational offerings. Students who developed academic problems were encouraged to make use of the nightly tutoring sessions, and those with severe problems were denied access to recreational activities until their teachers indicated that they were prepared academically.

Among the most successful and popular recreational activities were a field trip to Kitt Peak National Observatory in Tucson, Arizona, a PSAP Bowling League, Tuesday evening roller skating excursions on the ASU campus, a jogging club, the Fourth of July picnic and fireworks display, and free swim periods at the Aquatics Center. Many game tournaments and contests were held, and the results were posted daily on a bulletin board.

It was a credit to the students that discipline never became a major problem throughout the six week program. Close communication between staff members, personal involvement with the students on the part of the staff, and a conscious attempt to develop a sense of community between all participants did much to prevent problems from developing. The staff held formal weekly meetings and daily informal discussion about the program and individual students, and Peter Finlay met individually with several students to facilitate personal development.

A structured but flexible set of rules and procedures was used as a guideline for student behavior. The basic set of rules as explained to the students the first day included: (a) Respect the rights of others, (b) no drugs, alcohol, self medication or tobacco, (c) no visitation to the room or floor of students of the opposite sex, and (d) always sign in and sign out.

Students were not allowed to leave the dormitory during the first week without an adult, escort except for classes. (The following week this rule was revised so that students could go various places in small groups during daylight hours but still needed an adult escort after dark.) Later, students were required to sign out whenever they left the dormitory area so that the staff had an accurate record of their whereabouts at all times. A 9:00 p.m. curfew was enforced, after which all students had to be in Best Hall. After 9:00 p.m., the hall doors were locked for security, and any student who dallied in the adjacent building's game room had to call a counselor by telephone to be let into the wing. When a student violated the curfew or sign-out policy, he or she was reminded by a counselor about the necessity for the rules.

For more serious violations of the behavior code a three strike system was used. Students were allowed three "strikes," and once a child used up all three, he or she could be dismissed from the program and sent home without receiving a refund of the program fees. After receiving a strike, a letter was sent home to the parents detailing the incident that led to the strike, and a detailed disciplinary report was completed by both the student and a counselor. This three strike strategy proved to be a strong deterrent, with only one child choosing to exercise his option (by default) to return home.

Rather than being punitive in design, these strikes were used to ensure the children's well-being. A strike was awarded only when a student endangered his own safety or the safety of others or seriously disrupted the learning environment. In point of fact, fewer than 10 strikes were issued throughout the six weeks by the academic and recreational staffs combined.

Some of the things that seemed to work well during the summer included the following: the esprit de corps which developed among the students (one of the students published a newsletter which he sent to other alumni), the reinforcement the students received in their academic pursuits by the tutoring offered in the dormitory; the positive reputation the PSAP students developed on campus for their behavior both in and out of the dormitory (a Housing Office employee informed PSAP's director that their students took better care of their rooms and common areas than the college undergraduates did during the academic year); and the social development of these students reported to us later by parents who communicated satisfaction with their children's more mature behaviors and improved social skills.

These reports appear to be attributable to the changes occasioned by living in a structured dormitory environment with more widely varied input and opportunity for interaction than exist within a family. Students did their own laundry, cleaned their own rooms, scheduled their own free time, chose their own friends from within a large intellectual peer group, and even selected the food they ate from the variety offered in the cafeteria. The diversity of the students' interests and backgrounds and their need to adapt and adjust to others outside their immediate family was an enlightening experience for many of them. Having an intellectual peer group was also a new experience for many of them. Comments our staff heard during the first few days of the program included, "I never had to work hard in school to be the best before I came here," "I used to think I was smart but around here I'm just average!" and "I've finally met some kids who know what I'm talking about when we talk."

A few of the problems encountered during the summer included teaching some students how to operate a washing machine (one boy managed to get through the entire six weeks without washing clothes by simply rotating the least dirty), the distance between our dormitory and the cafeteria (less than a mile, but in the middle of an Arizona summer day a bit discouraging), parents who took their children home every weekend and out to dinner during the week until a more rigid visitation schedule was instituted (the staff felt the continuous "vacations" disrupted the student's concentration and interrupted the socialization process), the distractions caused by many students bringing personal portable televisions and various other electronic diversions for use in their rooms, and students complaints regarding the staff policy that male and female students were not allowed on each other's floors or in each other's rooms. A "clear the air" meeting was held to allow everyone to discuss their position. The general consensus allowed that it was a rule that everyone could live with.

From this one summer's experience and subsequent feedback from the students through a program evaluation form and from both the students and the parents more informal communications, PSAP staff members feel confident in concluding that the program was a success. Hence, the residential program will not be radically altered this summer. The program will be essentially the same, with any changes evolving out of the needs of the students and staff as the summer progresses.

This summer 150 students will be living at ASU for the six week program, which began June 20th and will end July 30th. There will be, of course, an increased residential staff.

For more information concerning the residential program, please write PSAP, Residential Summer Program, Department of Special Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287.

*Craig Blurton is Associate Editor of the Chronicle. He is also a doctoral student in the Department of Elementary Education and a PSAP Project Associate.

TIPS (Tips for Intellectually Precocious Students) I.B.: AN INTERNATIONAL ALTERNATIVE

Ralph McBride, Ph.D.¹

A comprehensive, cohesive program for academically talented and highly motivated students, the International Baccalaureate (IB) provides public and independent secondary schools in Canada and the United States means for providing challenge and motivation. The IB program offers curricular outlines and standards of achievement in subjects traditionally studied in the last two years of high school, leading to a Diploma that is recognized by many universities throughout the world. A system of syllabi sets forth the objectives in each course, and examinations based on the concept that general education, at the upper secondary level, should encompass the development of the mental powers through which humans interpret, modify, and enjoy their environment.

With these principals in mind, an international group of educators have designed a curriculum that requires each student to become proficient in language and mathematics — the two most important tools of communication and analysis — and familiar with at least one subject that exemplifies the study of human behavior and another that exemplifies the process of scientific inquiry. An IB Diploma candidate is also required to participate in a course that reflects upon the truth, criteria, values, and interrelation of the subjects being studied and to develop an acquaintance with aesthetic and moral values by engaging in creative, aesthetic, or social service activities.

The program's broad range of subjects accommodates diverse student interests while adhering to the goals of a cohesive liberal education. As a result, students and teachers are motivated to develop fully their academic talents. It is structured in terms of the objectives it seeks to achieve as reflected in the requirements referred to above and is flexible in terms of the means for achieving these objectives, allowing variations according to the needs and resources of the school. This means the program can be adapted to different educational systems.

PARTICIPANTS

Participants are juniors and seniors in high school. They may elect to take individual classes or commit to the two-year prescribed diploma program. IB classes are recognized by many colleges and universities which will allow advanced class placement in these areas. Students not enrolled in the IB program may take IB classes for regular high school credit.

THE CURRICULUM

Embracing the last two years of secondary education, the curriculum of the IB Diploma program incorporates standards that assume a high level of achievement during the prior years. The subjects that comprise the main part of the curriculum are typical of those studied in the 11th and 12th grades — or 12th and 13th grades in 13 grade systems. Subjects are arranged according to six areas and the IB Diploma candidate is required to choose one subject from each area. The sixth subject, however, may come from either category 6 or from one of the first five categories.

The six areas and the subjects in which the IB program provide syllabi and examinations are as follows:

1. Language A (first language, generally that native to the student or the country)
2. Language B (a modern language)²
3. Study of Man (one of the following options):

a. history	e. psychology
b. geography	f. social anthropology
c. economics	g. business studies
d. philosophy	
4. Experimental Science (one of the following options):

a. biology	d. physical science
b. chemistry	e. scientific studies
c. physics	
5. Mathematics
6. One of the following:

a. plastic arts	e. an additional option under 3, 4 or 5
b. music	f. special syllabuses developed by IB schools
c. a classical language	g. computer studies
d. a second language B	

Diploma candidates must also take a seventh course created by IB and known as the Theory of Knowledge and spend at least one afternoon per week in a creative or aesthetic experience or social activity.

GRADING

Grades are a composite of international examination scores submitted to IB for scoring and the teacher's evaluation of the classroom performance. The IB office in Geneva is responsible for the preparation and grading of all IB examinations.

UNIVERSITY RECOGNITION

A large number of universities and colleges in the United States and Canada recognize the IB Diploma for purposes of admission, course credit/advanced standing or advanced placement without credit or a combination of these. Individual IB class certificates are also recognized in both countries for course credit/advanced standing or advanced placement or both.

FEES

Fees are charged participating schools and students to provide syllabus, examinations, etc., and support the program.

The International Baccalaureate program is sponsored and administered by the International Baccalaureate Office (IBO), a Swiss foundation with headquarters in Geneva. The IBO is represented in Canada and the United States by International Baccalaureate North America, Inc. (IBNA). For further information, contact: H. Gilbert Nicol, Executive Director, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10019, (212) 266-4215.

¹Dr. McBride is the Director of Special Education in the Chandler Unified School District #80, Chandler, Arizona.

²Latin may be offered as a language B with the special permission of the IBO Geneva.

TAPS (Tips for Artistically Precocious Students) ACTORS LAB AZ OFFERS YOUTH WORKSHOPS

Actors Lab Arizona is offering a variety of workshops for aspiring young actors and actresses throughout the summer. Lessons in mime, rhythm, improvisation, and creative drama are available for youngsters.

Five to seven year old thespians can enroll in a Creative Drama Workshop which begins July 10 and meets on Saturday mornings. Eight to fourteen year olds can choose workshops in Mime July 17, Mask and Movement July 24, or an Orff Musical Instrument Workshop July 31.

In addition, a Performing Arts Workshop is being offered from July 26 through August 13 for eight to fourteen year olds which will be held Monday through Friday in the afternoons.

For further information, contact Actors Lab Arizona, 7624 E. Indian School Road, Suite 114, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251, or call (602) 990-1731.

NEW ARIZONA LAW

Governor Bruce Babbitt signed a new bill (SB 1140) into law April 20, 1982, which requires, among other provisions, the use of separate mathematical and verbal reasoning scores obtained in an out-of-level testing paradigm when identifying students for participation in programs for the gifted.

The law, sponsored by Arizona State Senator Robert Usdane, requires that the State Board of Education "Adopt a list of approved tests . . . which shall provide for separate mathematical reasoning scores and separate verbal reasoning scores and shall be capable of providing reliable and valid scores at the highest ranges of the score distribution."

The use of separate mathematical and verbal reasoning scores is necessary to diagnose effectively students' educational needs and to help plan appropriate educational services for them. In the past, a "global" score such as an I.Q. score has been allowed to place students in programs for the gifted, resulting in educational groupings which were often ineffective. For example, since an I.Q. test measures a wide range of abilities including mathematical and verbal reasoning, but reports the results as a single score for the various behaviors measured, it is possible for two children to achieve the same I.Q. score while having very different educational needs. One child may have done brilliantly on the verbal items of the test but poorly on other kinds of items while another child did just the opposite. Both, however, are reported as having identical I.Q.'s. With this information as the basis for placement, both children could be placed in an advanced

writing class, which would clearly only meet the educational needs of one of them.

The law also provides that:

The governing Board of each school district shall develop a scope and sequence for the identification and education of gifted pupils to ensure that gifted students receive special education commensurate with their academic abilities and potentials. The scope and sequence shall provide for out-of-level testing if the gifted pupil's test scores indicate that the pupil is achieving at grade level. . . . For the purposes of this section, 'out-of-level' testing means administration of a test designed for a particular age group or grade level to pupils in a younger age group or pupils at a lower grade level.

This provision in the new law will minimize what is known in testing jargon as the "ceiling effect." The ceiling effect is felt when a very able student takes a test designed for average students of the same age or grade level. Due to the limitations of test design, few items on the test will be difficult enough to measure his ability. At best, the test will simply report that the student is indeed at the top of his age or grade level, but information as to how far advanced or how very able he may be is not provided. By administering a test designed for older children or children in a higher grade, sufficient "ceiling" is provided in the test to describe very able students' abilities accurately.

By requiring testing for placement in programs for the gifted that yield both mathematical and verbal scores, a much more suitable detailed individual educational plan can be developed for each child. Further, the use of tests of reasoning rather than achievement allows assessment of how able a child reasons rather than how much he already knows.

Those familiar with the Project for the Study of Academic Precocity (PSAP) realize that it has advocated the use of such out-of-level testing since 1979. It has also been PSAP's policy to advocate tests which yield separate mathematical and verbal reasoning scores rather than a global score for use in educational diagnosis and planning.

Each year, during the Western States Talent Search, PSAP uses the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as a second screen device to identify very able mathematical and verbal reasoners. The SAT yields separate mathematical and verbal subscores and, while it was originally designed for use with high school seniors, PSAP administers it to students of junior high school age who have scores in the ninth stanine on an age appropriate achievement test at their school. For students younger than a junior high school age, PSAP recommends using the School and College Abilities Test (SCAT) in an out-of-level testing paradigm. For further information, write Out-of-level Testing, c/o PSAP, Department of Special Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION: A PLAN FOR SUCCESS

*Steven M. Brown and Paul H. Koehler**

When is the right time to seek input from your educational community? To what extent should an advisory group be allowed to recommend changes of policy or program? What is the responsibility of the District Administration in such an area? These are questions that were addressed by the District Administration in the Madison Elementary School District, in north-central Phoenix, Arizona, when a citizens' advisory group investigated the verbally and mathematically talented programs.

The Academic Enrichment Program in the Madison District has recently been changed into an academically based program and, during the metamorphosis, a great debate took place between various special interest groups in this generally upper-middle class community. Parents have always taken a special pride, and still do, in the educational excellence of the District programs. Any time there is change, everyone who will be touched in some way by the change wants to be heard. The program has now passed its six month birthday, and parents are generally pleased with the success of the new direction the program has taken.

The timing of seeking community involvement is crucial to the type and degree of contributions made from advisory groups. Although some school administrators balk at the prospect of having "lay" groups get too involved in policy or program development, the philosophy of the Madison School District is to seek input from the community at all stages of decision making. This is not only healthy to the organization, but it creates a feeling of "ownership" as the parents have "bought in" to the changes. Good change-agent theory stresses involvement of all clients who will be affected by change. When the District Administration in Madison wanted to refine the student identification process for

the Academic Enrichment Program, a detailed plan was thought out in order to leave no stone unturned.

The first step was to present a scenario to the entire Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC), with the recommendation that a subcommittee of five or six parents be selected to study the Academic Enrichment Program. Once the smaller group was chosen, the District Director of the Program and the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction recommended a sequential timetable of activities. The major role of the Administration when working with advisory groups is to take the leadership role in the area of educating the group with facts, figures, and good supporting data. All too often, advisory groups are allowed to act totally independent of the District and sometimes make recommendations based on emotion or inadequate information. By providing sound information to parents, the administration can ensure wiser and more comprehensive recommendations. Of course, there will be exceptions to this premise. Acting within parameters of acceptability, the citizens' group can work in such a way that the interests of the district are not jeopardized.

The Madison District chose to "bare the soul" of the Academic Enrichment Program to the parents. It is far better to answer questions honestly and completely than it is to shroud issues in educational jargon and rhetoric. Parents want to know "the bottom line," and not merely a philosophical treatise. District administrators should never forget the caveat: Be honest and direct in all responses to parents, board members and teachers; otherwise, the credibility and integrity of the District may be lost. The results of providing not only the conceptual framework but also the pertinent data to the parents' group was a dialogue that was realistic and rational, not useless due to incomplete information.

The logical progression of events did take place during a three month period of time in which the Sub-Committee of the CAC studied such topics as test selection, test bias, curriculum, teacher selection criteria, and class size. Once the group reached consensus, which often is quite difficult to achieve, the entire Advisory Committee voted unanimously to accept the report. Now, when the District Administration prepares formal program recommendations to the Board of Trustees, it can feel confident that parents have been heard. A series of school-level informational meetings were held in order to summarize the Committee findings and to report on the recommendations of the District. The chairperson of the Sub-Committee was also in attendance at several of these meetings to validate the Committee recommendations. Parents seem to appreciate the thoroughness and clarity of meetings which have a real focus. The substance of the presentation must be simple to understand and without much of the jargon and catch-phrases we are so free to use.

The same type of presentation of program recommendations was made to the teachers in the program. Again, a presentation with good visuals makes the change process easier to manage. The most important lesson in this article is that the District must have a clear and thorough understanding of where it wants the various advisory groups to head. If no direction is provided, whether asked for or not, the results may not only be alarming but can be disastrous. The District will receive the level of results proportionate to the degree of guidance and direction provided by the administration. Parents of verbally or mathematically talented students are sometimes quite vocal and may try to manipulate the district. By utilizing the simplicity outlined in this model, the positive management of advisory groups can occur.

*Dr. Steve Brown is Director of Funded and Enrichment Programs and Dr. Paul Koehler is Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services in the Madison Elementary School District, Phoenix, Arizona 85016.

THE JUNIOR GREAT BOOKS SERIES

The Junior Great Books Series is published by the Great Books Foundation, 307 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60601. It is a critical reading and discussion program designed to develop the interpretive reading and discussion skills of students in second through ninth grades.

Although intended to be used for all students reading at grade level or above, The Junior Great Books Series is easily adaptable for use with academically talented children. It has been used in many programs for the gifted across the country.

While participating in the program, each student independently reads a group assignment selected from traditional and modern stories, poems, and plays. The students meet usually once a week under the guidance of a trained discussion leader for a thirty to ninety minute discussion (depending upon the grade level).

To use the series and become a discussion leader, a Basic Leader Training Course consisting of four two-and-a-half hour sessions given on two consecutive days is required by The Foundation. The in-service workshop provides instruction for each teacher in group discussion skills and the Basic Series method of learning called "Shared Inquiry."

Sample reading selections from The Junior Great Books Series include *The Velveteen Rabbit* by Margery Williams (2nd grade), *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll (6th grade), and *The Honest Thief* by Fyodor Dostoyevsky (9th grade). Each grade level series consists of at least a dozen selections.

DIRECTORIES OF RESOURCES FOR THE GIFTED AND TALENTED

Two useful directories of resources for gifted and talented students have come to our attention. We recommend them highly to parents of gifted students and to teachers and administrators of programs for the gifted and talented.

The first, *Directory of Learning Resources for the Gifted and Talented*, can be ordered by writing to the Directory Editor, Croft-NEI Publications, 24 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06386.

The Croft-NEI *Directory* lists periodicals, information centers, professional training centers, federal officials, programs, and agencies, national and state organizations and associations, all of which deal specifically with the gifted and talented. The directory also has "Special Features," interspersed between the various sections, which include topics like "Gifted and Talented Programs That Work," "Identifying the Gifted and Talented in the Visual and Performing Arts," and "Do You Need a Differentiated Program for Your Gifted Students? A Self-Assessment Inventory for Guiding Education of the Gifted."

The second, the Arizona Association for the Gifted and Talented's (AAGT) *Resources for Researchers*, is a valuable regional listing of educational activities and opportunities for the gifted and talented in Arizona. AAGT's directory is organized into topic headings, beginning with "Actor" and ending with "Zoology," and gives the name, address, and telephone number for each topic's contact person. Those activities for which a fee is charged are so noted.

To order copies of *Resources for Researchers*, contact Dr. Larry Hostettler, 6451 E. Shea Blvd., Scottsdale, Arizona 85254, 246-8009 or 991-9878. AAGT provides the directory free of charge.

In addition to the reading selections, every grade level series includes statements and exercises designed to teach and reinforce reading comprehension and discussion skills.

CORRESPONDENCE TO THE CHRONICLE

We have been receiving many interesting and, in some cases, morale boosting letters from readers of the *Chronicle*, including one from Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

The editorial staff of the *Chronicle* has discussed establishing a regular "Letters to the Editor" feature in each issue, and we may if the volume of mail remains at its present level.

In addition to more conventional greetings and best wishes, we've even received two communications written partially in Latin (straining, we must admit, our somewhat limited repertoire of ancient languages).

Mrs. Muriel Tamura of Lake Oswego, Oregon, enclosed the following note with her subscription order:

Right on, PSAP! But we need you in Oregon. Please allow Oregon students to participate in your Talent Searches. Our school district is coming along with SMPY's math philosophy (many 7th-graders in high school algebra; SAT's offered to 7th and 8th graders), but we are floundering terribly in science and language arts. Anxiously awaiting next issue, (signed) Mrs. Mits (Muriel) Tamura

We wish to reassure Mrs. Tamura, as well as other concerned parents and teachers, that PSAP is expanding next year and will include Oregon, Alaska, and Hawaii, as well as Arizona, California, and Washington in the Western States Talent Search. The Canadian provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario will also be included.

We continue to be very interested in hearing from you, our readers. Your comments, contributions, and suggestions are appreciated.